UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,825	03/12/2001	Andrew D. Dingsor	RSW920000169US1	1006

7590 06/03/2005	EXAMINER

Esther H. Chong, Esquire
Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP
2600 Aramark Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950

EXAMINER
COLLINS, SCOTT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/803,825	DINGSOR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Scott M. Collins	2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _01 November 2004_.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-21_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-21_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-21 examined.

2.   It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file: Request for Reconsideration on 11/01/2004.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed 11/01/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's central argument is that the Bector reference does not teach bypassing a network address translation (NAT) server on the response path. However, the Examiner is unsure what to make of these arguments since the Bector reference is entirely concerned with how to bypass network traffic around any machine, be it NAT servers, generic servers, data servers, origin servers etc. The examiner disagrees with applicant's arguments and stands on the previous rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bector et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,687,732 (herein referred to as Bector).

6.   Referring to claims 1, 2, and 4, Bector has taught a method of processing a client packet

from a client in a NAT system including a NAT machine and a plurality of servers (Bector

abstract; column 5, lines 32-41; and figure 1), the method comprising the steps of :

a.   preparing a response packet responsive to the client packet (Bector figures 1 and

2A; column 6, 38-43);

b.   determining whether translation instructions are stored in said one of the servers

(Bector figure 2B, elements 228, 230);

c.   performing, by one of the servers, a translation operation on the response packet

to produce a translated response packet (Bector figure 2A, elements 120, 202, 204, 206;

figure 2B, elements 230 and 234; column 6, lines 61-67); and

d.   transmitting the translated response packet directly to the client, thereby

bypassing the NAT machine (Bector figure 2A, elements 202, 204, 206; figure 2B,

element 236; column 5, lines 25-31; and column 6, lines 38-55).

7.   Referring to claim 3, Bector has taught the method further comprising sending the

response packet from said one of the servers to the NAT machine if the determining step

indicates that the translation instructions are not stored in said one of the servers (Bector figure

2B, elements 230 and 234; column 9, lines 14-30).

8.   Referring to claim 5, Bector has taught the method further comprising:

a.   determining, by the NAT machine, if predetermined criteria have been satisfied

for sending the translation instructions to said one of the servers (Bector column 9, lines 4-13);

and

b.   sending the translation instructions to said one of the servers if the predetermined

criteria have been satisfied (Bector figure 2B, elements 230 and 232; column 9, lines 14-25).

9.   Referring to claim 6, Bector has taught the method wherein the translation instructions

identify information to be modified in a header of the response packet (Bector column 5, lines

25-31; and column 20, lines 8-13).

10.   Referring to claim 7, Bector has taught the method wherein the performing step includes:

a.   evaluating a header of the response packet to identify a current IP destination

address and a current destination port indicated in the header (Bector figure 2B, element

226; column 5, lines 25-31; and column 8, line 63 – column 9, line 3);

b.   determining, using the translation instructions, a client IP address and a client port

associated with the current IP destination address and the current destination port (Bector

figure 2B, element 228; and column 9, lines 4-25); and

c.   modifying the header of the response packet to designate the client IP address and

client port as the current IP destination address and the current destination port,

respectively (Bector figure 2B, element 234; column 9, lines 26-30; and column 20, lines

8-13).

11.   Referring to claim 8, Bector has taught the method further comprising:

a.   transmitting, by the NAT machine, instructions to stop the translation

operation (Bector figure 2C; and column 9, line 63 – column 10, line 19); and

b.   transmitting, by said one of the servers, the response packet to the NAT

machine according to said instructions (Bector figure 2C; and column 9, line 63 – column

10, line 19).

12.   Claims 9-14 do not recite limitations above the claimed invention set forth in claims 1-4, and 6-8 and are therefore rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-4, and 6-8 above. The only difference in the sets of claims is that claims 9-14 detail the system used for accomplishing the method of claims 1-4, and 6-8.

13.   Claims 15-21 do not recite limitations above the claimed invention set forth in claims 1-8 and are therefore rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-8 above. The only difference in the sets of claims is that claims 15-21 detail the computer program product embodied on a computer readable medium for accomplishing the method of claims 1-8.

Conclusion

14.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott M. Collins whose telephone number is 571.272.3934. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia Martin-Wallace can be reached on 571.272.6159. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

smc
May 26, 2005

VALENCIA MARTIN-WALLACE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER